

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY REVIEW BOARD

**John L. O'Brien Building
504 15th Avenue, Hearing Room C
Olympia, Washington
November 10, 2005
9:00 AM**

Final Amended Minutes

<u>MEMBERS PRESENT</u>	<u>REPRESENTING</u>	<u>MEMBERS ABSENT</u>	<u>REPRESENTING</u>
Gerald "Butch" Reifert	Design Industry	Rocky Sharp	Specialty Contractor
Ed Kommers	Specialty Contractor	Vacant	House of Representatives (R)
David D. Johnson	Construction Trades Labor	Sen. Dave Schmidt	Senate (R)
Carolyn Crowson	OMWBE		
Olivia Yang	Higher Education		
John Lynch (Chair)	General Administration		
Rodney Eng	Cities/Counties/Ports		
Michael Mequet	Cities/Counties/Ports		
Wendy Keller	Public Hospital Project Rvw Bd		
Dan Vaught	School District Project Rvw Bd		
Rep. Kathy Haigh (Vice Chair)	House of Representatives (D)		
Gary Ballew	Cities/Counties/Ports		
Larry Byers	Insurance/Surety Industry		
Daniel Absher	General Contractor		
Sen. Phil Rockefeller	Senate (D)		

STAFF & GUESTS

Nancy Deakins, GA	Marsha Brascher, Team Tech
Searetha Kelly, GA	Tom Brascher, Team Tech
Valerie Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services	Larry Stevens, Attorney at Law
Tom Peterson, Hoffman Construction	
Paul Szumlanski, GA	
Shari Zariczny, Centennial Construction	
Ashley Probart, AWC	
Ginger Eagle, WPPA	
Darlene Septelka, WSU	

Welcome & Introductions – Chair's Comments

Chair John Lynch called the Capital Projects Advisory Review Board (CPARB) meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

Chair Lynch provided introductory comments about the Board's subcommittees' work to date. Chair Lynch introduced Senator Phil Rockefeller. Members present provided self-introductions.

A meeting quorum was attained. Chair Lynch advised that the Board's meetings fall under the Open Public Meetings Act and are open to the public. He directed members to a copy of RCW 42.30, which defines a meeting as any meeting at which action is taken, and defines action as including any deliberations or

discussions among members – and are public records. Chair Lynch advised subcommittee meeting dates will also be publicized.

Chair Lynch provided clarification about Governor Gregoire's Executive Commissioner Conference on December 15, 2005. The conference is open to gubernatorial appointees. Invitation to the Governor's reception at the Executive Mansion following the conference is limited to gubernatorial appointees.

Approve Agenda

Daniel Absher moved, seconded by Dave Johnson, to approve the agenda as presented. Motion carried.

Approval of October 13, 2005 Minutes

Several corrections were requested to the minutes of October 13, 2005:

On page 13, the table title of "Issue Title" at the bottom of the page should be replaced with "Action items for discussion and possible completion by December 2005."

On page 8 within the second to last paragraph at the bottom of the page, replace "DDB" with "DBB."

On page 13, within the fifth full paragraph from the top of the page, revise the last sentence in the paragraph to read, "However, it is the Board's responsibility to either consider or set aside traditional public works at this time."

On page 7, correct Olivia Yang's name.

Wendy Keller moved, seconded by Ed Kommers, to approve the minutes of October 13, 2005 as amended. Motion carried unanimously.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Continue Strategic Planning

Chair Lynch advised that the strategic planning process will help define the issues that will be segregated into different groups and assigned to subcommittees. The process will help define the Board's work as well as identifying the deliverables to meet the expectation of the Legislature and the legislation.

Senator Rockefeller commented on the Board's work to date and each member's input on what they believe success will be as well as failure. The responses collectively were very much on point. Obviously, members of different specialties and industries have their own unique experience to contribute. However, collectively, the Board represents a broad cross-cut of industry stakeholders. The process as committed to by the Board will enable the Board to attain what the legislation intended.

Dave Johnson referred to Representative Haigh's comments within the minutes regarding the Board's responsibility in reviewing traditional contracting methods, particularly Design/Bid/Build (DBB) as referenced in the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee (JLARC) report and references to lowest, responsible bidder. Representative Haigh specifically inserted the language of "traditional" because it would be difficult to review General Contractor/Construction Manager Method (GC/CM) without first having a clear understanding of how DBB works. The JLARC report references "lowest, responsible bidder." For GC/CM, there are eligibility requirements and for procurement there are responsible bidder requirements. However, in DBB or typical public works projects contracting, the requirements speak to "lowest, responsible, responsive bidder." Agencies feel pressure because there is no definition of "responsible bidder" under the statute. Based on the

discussion and the additional language added by Representative Haigh, it appears it is one area that needs to be considered in the traditional bidding method or statute. The issue has been problematic for the industry.

Representative Haigh arrived at the meeting at 9:28 p.m.

Representative Haigh said when the Board begins reviewing the criteria for consideration, the Board will likely consider the issue especially as it relates to quality and qualifications.

Tom Brascher, Team Tech, revisited the Board's quick start strategic planning process. Each member identified three top topics followed by an exercise to identify what topics fall into short, medium, and long-term groupings for assignment to subcommittees. The intent is to address and categorize all issues into reasonable groupings followed by assignment to the subcommittees. The Board partially completed its work at the last meeting.

Mr. Brascher said the quick start planning process is designed to develop the strategic plan through the input of the Board and subcommittees to develop a structure showing topics and linkages to ESHB 1830. Subcommittee discussions will include:

- Objectives and Outcomes Expected
- Linkage to the legislation and how it complies
- Schedule – including milestones and output products
- Benefits to the industry due to this focus topic
- Who was/is involved

The information will be presented to the Board for further review, approval, and implementation.

Chair Lynch reported the goal is to produce a draft of an executive summary with input from the subcommittees by December 2005. Mr. Brascher said drafts from each subcommittee will also be presented.

Mr. Brascher led the Board on its continued exercise of voting for member's identified top three topics and how they ranked for possible completion by December 2005, August 2006, December 2006, or later. He outlined previous votes and identified the topics that were linked from the first exercise.

Chair Lynch noted many of the topics are already under discussion by the subcommittees. The Board completed voting on topics that could be completed by December 2005.

Discussion ensued about how to address those topics that are already under discussion by subcommittees. Senator Rockefeller asked for clarification on topics receiving votes for both the December 2005 and August 2006 timeframe.

Mr. Brascher said the first assignments for subcommittees of schedule, deliverables, and milestones will be the process for determining a topic's timeline priority.

Discussion ensued about the Board's discussion about the August 2006 through December 2006 timeline and consideration for topics that might fall within the timeline. Representative Haigh reminded the Board that the current legislation does not sunset until 2007, but that there are currently no projects for school districts. There is substantial funding earmarked in the budget for school capital projects. There was also discussion that there is a sense the Legislature will want to give more projects to the Project Review Board for school districts. Chair Lynch suggested it could be one of the deliverables by December 2005. Representative agreed and said there is an increased pressure for some action this year but not for complete removal of the sunset at this point.

Senator Rockefeller said perhaps the sentiment of the Board is to extend the authority but perhaps in a changed or modified format. It would be relatively easy to reach consensus on preserving the legislation but could be more difficult as the details of the legislation are defined, which would entail a longer-term discussion.

Mr. Brascher asked members to identify topics already discussed by subcommittees. Members identified the topics under discussion by a subcommittee:

<u>TOPIC</u>	<u>SUBCOMMITTEE</u>
Legislative expansion of alternative public works contracting methods	3
Low Bid Contractor Selection	3
Add "Best Value" to APW	3
Sub Contractor Eligibility:	2
<i>Linked with:</i>	
- <i>GC/CM subcontractor selection – clarification of the standards</i>	
Standardize Subcontracts:	2
<i>Linked with:</i>	
- <i>Develop standard subcontract terms & conditions for Contracts between GC/CM's and subcontractors</i>	
Proper Allocation of Risk:	2
<i>Linked with:</i>	
- <i>GC/risk transfer</i>	
- <i>Outside of Legislative Recommendation, and for discussion</i>	
- <i>Clarification of risk on GC/CM – Shifting of risk to subcontractors</i>	
<i>a. Different ways of responding to Escalation & Market Conditions</i>	
MACC timing on GC/CM Projects:	2
<i>Linked with:</i>	
- <i>Outside of Legislative recommendation, and for a. When to set the MACC</i>	
Opening the Market to smaller local contractors	3
Change Orders - % of markup	2
Require owners and GC/CM's response to change order requests within a	
Reasonable period of time	2
Prohibit incentive provisions tied to MACC contingency except for	2
schedule milestones and buyout contingency	

Mr. Brascher said the intent of the quick start planning process is to use the model to reach the saturation point. He asked for the Board's input of continuing the process because as the subcommittees begin working on the topics and as time moves forward, priorities may change on what topics/groups should move forward. The model can work well to add new items and then reprioritize them for future assignments.

Carolyn Crowson suggested not ending the process as many of the constituents have some important topics that are below the list of topics completed at the last meeting. Mr. Johnson agreed and added that as members reviewed the top three topics of each member, many of the topics have naturally gravitated to a subcommittee. The list should be completed for the benefit of all constituencies.

Several members were asked to clarify the intent of some of the remaining topics. Members continued their review and voting on the timeline for each of the remaining topics.

Action items for discussion and possible completion by: **Aug 06** **Dec 06** **Later**

- Bid Shopping (Release of all sub-tier awards)	8	5	8
- Apprenticeship utilization	3	8	5
- Low participation of minority firms in public contracting	0	10	
- Prime contractor planning and reporting <i>(Linked with Low participation of minority firms in public contracting) – Assigned to Subcommittee 1</i>			
- Prompt payment of vendors and contractors	8	12	0
- Better define APW users			
- Right size of subcontractor packages	1	2	11
- The choice of which method of contracting to use is a key initial decision to be made <i>Assigned to Subcommittees 2 & 3</i>	18		
- Responsible bidder definitions under Design/Bid/Build		14	0
- MEP (Mech/Elec/Plum) involvement during design	4	10	9
- Compliance with Qualifications Based Selection (QBS) laws	0	8	12
- Bid Shopping (Release of all sub-tier awards)	8	5	8
- Apprenticeship Utilization	3	8	5
- Prompt payment of vendors and contractors	8	12	0

The meeting was recessed from 10:41 a.m. to 10:54 a.m.

Members completed the assignment of timelines to the remaining topics.

Mr. Brascher reviewed subcommittees established to date and their respective focus:

Subcommittee #1 – Data Collection; establish data collection system that is consistent

Subcommittee #2 – Reauthorization of Alternative Public Works (formerly call Sunset Review); how to break up the topics of sunset review

Subcommittee #3 – Expansion; new users of APW, new methods & new projects

Representative Haigh noted the timeline for topics assigned to subcommittee #1 is December 2005. If most of the subcommittee recommendations are completed by December 2005 or August 2006 at the latest, there could be a reassignment of work. Chair Lynch said there may be sufficient DBB issues that can be grouped together and reviewed by a future traditional methods subcommittee. Rodney Eng added some members wanted to be on the data collection subcommittee for a variety of reasons and they may not want to address DBB issues. The Chair's suggestion of establishing a new subcommittee is reasonable.

Members agreed to establish subcommittee #4. Mr. Johnson said it appears the focus is on GC/CM because of the sunset. He indicated he would like to highlight the emphasis in the JLARC report and within the legislation that point to traditional contracting methods as a part of the effort as well. To move beyond and go forward with CG/CM without considering traditional contracting methods is not something he can support. Mr. Johnson volunteered to serve as lead on subcommittee #4.

The Board discussed the subcommittee's title and agreed to title the subcommittee "Industry Wide Issues" focusing on "modifications or refinements for industry wide issues that affect Public Works." Members commented on their respective time commitments as well as serving on other subcommittees and recommended instituting the 4th subcommittee in spring 2006. Members agreed to discuss activating the committee early in 2006.

Dan Absher, Butch Reifert, Ed Kommers, Carolyn Crowson, Olivia Yang, Gary Ballew, Rodney Eng, Michael Mequet, Wendy Keller, as well as a representative (name provided by Chair Lynch) from General Administration volunteered to serve on the subcommittee.

Mr. Eng recommended renaming the Sunset Subcommittee to Reauthorization of Alternative Public Works Subcommittee to better define the focus of the subcommittee's work

Members reviewed the remaining unassigned topics and agreed with the following subcommittee assignments:

<u>Action items assigned to subcommittees</u>	<u>Subcommittee</u>
- Low bid contractor selection	3
- Responsible bidder definitions under Design/Bid/Build	4
- Compliance with Qualifications Based Selection (QBS) laws	4
- Bid Shopping (Release of all sub-tier awards)	4
- Prompt payment of vendors and contractors	4
- Right size of subcontractor packages	4
- Compliance with Qualifications Based Selection (QBS) laws	4
- Apprenticeship Utilization	4
- Consistent evaluation criteria (of projects requesting use of alternate contracting methods)	1

Chair Lynch commented that the topic titled, "Compliance with Qualification Based Selection (QBS) Laws" doesn't appear to be a good fit with any of the four subcommittees. He shared that he and Nancy Deakins are attending quarterly meetings of the Architects Engineers Agencies Committee that may be willing to address the topic and make a recommendation to the Board. The committee is comprised of representatives from American Institute of Architects (AIA) and American Council of Engineering Companies (ACEC) and several state agencies. Chair Lynch said he will ask the committee to consider the topic to ascertain if it is willing to address and make a recommendation on the topic.

Mr. Brascher recommended some members of subcommittee #4 should provide staff with preliminary information about how the subcommittee plans to pull the issues together. Ms. Yang pointed out that Dan Absher's original list included issues pertaining to alternative public works contracting and issues regarding traditional public works. Perhaps rather than considering the group as subcommittee #4, the effort should be considered as phase 2. When the issues are reviewed in March and April it might be more efficient to take all the industry-wide issues and break them into further subcommittees much like the existing subcommittees. It could also benefit the Board to ascertain how much has been accomplished by March or April as well as considering member's availability and then make a decision at that time.

Mr. Absher volunteered to categorize the issues that are outside alternative procurement. Chair Lynch confirmed if Mr. Absher can complete the task by January 2006, the Board should be able to incorporate the information within the strategic plan.

Mr. Brascher reported the information from the exercise will be resorted and grouped accordingly. As a closing topic, Mr. Brascher said the mission and the four directives from the legislature have been revised to reflect legislative compliance of ESHB 1830 to determine if there are any topics that need to be added to the list for subcommittee consideration:

- A. To provide an evaluation of public capital projects construction processes, including the impact of contracting methods on project outcomes, and to advise the legislature on policies related to alternative public works delivery methods.
- B. Develop and recommend to the legislature criteria that may be used to determine effective and feasible use of alternative contracting procedures.

- C. Develop and recommend to the legislature qualification standards for general contractors bidding on alternative public works projects.
- D. Develop and recommend to the legislature policies to further enhance the quality, efficiency, and accountability of Capital Construction Projects through the use of traditional and alternative delivery methods in Washington and make recommendations regarding expansion, continuation elimination, or modification of the alternative public works contracting methods.
- E. Evaluate the potential future use of other alternative contracting procedures including competitive negotiation contracts.

Chair Lynch said he was unfamiliar with the term “competitive negotiation contracts.” He said he recently attended a presentation about the method that is used by public utilities. The method is considerably different than what he has experienced in Public Works. The issue could be added because none of the subcommittees have been assigned the specific topic addressing the method. He suggested adding it to subcommittee #3’s list. Ms. Yang suggested including a presentation about the contracting method on the Board’s agenda for the December meeting.

Chair Lynch asked members to provide feedback.

Mr. Reifert requested inclusion of “high performance building standards” to the list under development by Mr. Absher.

Mr. Johnson suggested adding “and traditional” within provision A. Members discussed the recommendation recognizing that the provision is taken directly from the statute.

Ms. Yang offered a suggestion, if Mr. Absher is amenable, to undergo a similar process for Subcommittee #4. She noted her subcommittee’s focus is on alternative procurement. The subcommittee did not consider other issues. Chair Lynch acknowledged the process shouldn’t prelude the addition of other issues to the list.

Mr. Eng inquired about the need to formalize subcommittee assignments. Ms. Deakins responded the matter will be discussed later in the meeting under the subcommittee work agenda item.

Senator Rockefeller referred to the suggestion to add “and traditional” and noted the provision is from the first clause of Section 1 of the bill, which is part of the General Intent section of the bill. There appears to be some ambiguity in the general intent in that it doesn’t reference traditional as equally as it does alternative methods. He offered that perhaps he and Representative Haigh could pursue some clarification of the issue. Mr. Johnson added the Board has the duty to review those processes through the use of traditional and alternative delivery methods. It is part of what the Board has been charged with. Senator Rockefeller suggested not including the addition in the first statement as the legislation is sufficiently broad to encompass a full scope of review as well as the Board’s recent action to create subcommittee #4 to address the issues.

Dave Johnson moved, seconded by Wendy Keller, to include “traditional” as well as alternative public works methods as part of the Board’s mission statement.

Mr. Absher expressed disagreement with adopting a mission statement that is different from the legislation. The Legislature has provided the Board’s mission. Ms. Keller said she also agrees somewhat and that if the legislation is all encompassing to include all methods, perhaps it would be better not to include “traditional.”

The motion failed. Mr. Johnson voted in favor.

Ms. Keller expressed interest in receiving contact information about Quality Based Selection. Chair Lynch said the committee pursues architectural and engineering issues. King County is currently not a member, although there is no reason the county couldn't be. Chair Lynch confirmed he will provide contact information.

Mr. Mequet asked whether anyone has reviewed subcommittee lists to ensure there is no overlap or duplication of the topics between the subcommittees. Mr. Brascher advised members that many of the topics were linked as a block and assigned to a subcommittee.

Mr. Kommers commented on the intensive work required to examine alternative public works delivery. To open the door to traditional discussions will further slow the Board's work as there is much work to be undertaken within the subcommittees to provide a recommendation(s). If there is an overwhelming desire to overturn the alternative public works statute with some form of change, it will take much work to get to that point. Subcommittee members are dedicated and to take the same group and delegate some of the work regarding traditional methods will likely be more than the Board and subcommittees can handle especially with the expiration of the alternative public works statute looming in 2007. The focus of the effort should be on packaging an acceptable renewal of alternative public works. There will be other legislation concerning traditional methods. He suggested the Board should be reluctant to initiate the new subcommittee without evaluating the impact.

Representative Haigh said she has concerns but believes it is important to keep the issues before the Board. The issues may have to be pushed further out, but it's important to keep them on the table.

The meeting was recessed for lunch from 12:05 p.m. to 12:35 p.m.

Reports by Subcommittees

Sunset Review (Rodney Eng)

The renamed subcommittee (Reauthorization Subcommittee) met on November 3, 2005. Mr. Eng noted the challenge of coordinating the meeting because of member schedules. The subcommittee established a regular subcommittee for the first Thursday of every month from 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

The subcommittee developed a list of issues that are barriers to reauthorization. The list is comprised of 20 issues that the subcommittee believes could be barriers to reauthorization. During the development of the list, members spent time ensuring each member understood the issues. The list is not prioritized. Non-voting members also contributed issues to the list. After development of the list, each member was asked to prioritize the list. Some issues might be very high priority but may be too complex or difficult for the subcommittee to address first and consequently should be scheduled later. Members considered the deadline and scheduled eight meetings to afford time to submit a report to the Board in June or July 2006.

Mr. Eng noted the list is a grouping of prioritizations and recommended strategy for resolving the issues.

Chair Lynch asked if the deliverable will be a draft of suggested legislation or a list of elements that will need to be included in revised legislation. Mr. Eng said members did not fully discuss the format. He noted that he believes some of it will depend on the issues. Ideally, if a legislative "fix" is proposed, he said he assumes the subcommittee will propose the specific language that should be introduced. The deliverable in July should be draft legislation. However, he said he's unsure everything on the list is a draft legislation component. Discussion ensued on the uncertainty of what issues might evolve to legislative provisions and what issues might need to be flushed out as the subcommittee moves forward.

Chair Lynch announced Mr. Mequet has offered the Port of Seattle facility as a meeting location for subcommittee meetings. Several subcommittees have accepted the offer.

Mr. Mequet asked for an explanation on item 5, "User funded evaluation of projects." Mr. Eng said the item ties into the Data Collection Subcommittee. The concept is for those entities that use GC/CM to pay a fee to fund appropriate data collection and analysis. Representative Haigh said she believes the performance audits requested of state agencies should also be asked of any contract for any reason that includes public dollars. Chair Lynch suggested another option is to require any project to provide summary data in a standardized format. Mr. Eng said at this point, the subcommittee concentrated only on identifying issues.

Ms. Crowson said item 11, "Elimination of subcontractor listing requirements for sub-bids" appears to be counter to data collection. Mr. Kommers described the intent of the item.

Representative Haigh suggested including a descriptive paragraph for each of the 20 issues.

Expansion Subcommittee (Olivia Yang)

Ms. Yang reported the subcommittee met and developed list of issues as well as recognizing school districts need to be addressed quickly. The subcommittee is meeting the first Friday of the month. There will be several monthly meetings through February 2006 focusing on the first two broad issues – owners and project types. At that point, the subcommittee will assess its progress with a goal to have draft language drafted by mid-2006.

Mr. Reifert asked whether there was a request for the school districts to present information to the Board. Mr. Vaught confirmed he will present school district recommendations about the potential number of projects and justification for each recommendation. Chair Lynch said the subcommittee discussed the possibility of having Mr. Vaught and a member of the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) attend the next CPARB meeting in December to advise the Board about upcoming school district projects that could be potential projects for GC/CM. The goal is to learn what projects are pending and then determine if action is needed immediately and what will be necessary. Mr. Vaught said Mr. Reifert contacted him several days ago and the data collection has been initiated. He said he will also contact OSPI and obtain the number of projects that might be potentially authorized in February through initiatives.

Data Collection Subcommittee (Darlene Septelka)

The subcommittee met last week and reviewed the JLARC recommendations and discussed what questions need to be answered and what data will be required to address the questions. The subcommittee did not delve into the details of how, where, when, and who because the focus is to produce some deliverables by December 2005. The deliverable will include a list of project performance measures. The subcommittee has a milestone to complete the matrix by November 11. Ms. Septelka said she is receiving input from members on what items they feel the subcommittee should be focusing its efforts on to develop the matrix in the areas of schedule performance, cost performance, contract changes, contract selection process, subcontract selection process, third party consultants, protests and claims, and quality performance. The subcommittee will consider additional issues to consider under each of the performance areas.

The goal is to present a completed matrix at the December month. She invited members to email other items that should be addressed.

Ms. Septelka advised she will collect the input from the subcommittee and from other members and develop a master list of all performance measures for review by the subcommittee at its December 1 meeting. Ms. Septelka said she anticipates providing the Board with the performance measures that the subcommittee believes should be considered. From that point, the subcommittee will begin addressing who, what, where, and when. After the Board selects the performance measures, the subcommittee will begin working on how to go about collecting the data and who should be collecting the data.

Chair Lynch asked whether the performance measures will apply to all GC/CM and DBB projects and traditional projects. Ms. Septelka said subcommittee members discussed considering all three delivery methods. Some questions will only apply to Design/Build and only DBB. Members were asked to consider all three delivery methods and develop performance measures that could apply to any project.

Ms. Crowson said the subcommittee did discuss that there are some systems available for tracking some of the data and that it is a matter of mapping the data to existing systems. However, it is too costly to track previous data. The subcommittee agreed to a moving forward methodology for tracking information.

Mr. Eng asked whether the subcommittee is considering cost factors for collection of the information versus the value of the output to be provided. Ms. Septelka assured the Board that the goal is not to create a system that burdens contractors or owners. The issue speaks to what the Board wants asked. The subcommittee's role is to determine what data will answer that question. No one wants a big, expensive system. Representative Haigh said the subcommittee discussed what the private sector collects for its measurement systems. Mr. Kommers reported many reports are submitted to the Office of Financial Management and the subcommittee needs to ask what is included in the reports and how the reports are used. Ms. Septelka confirmed it's important for OFM to be represented on the subcommittee. Additionally, the subcommittee needs several members representing general contractors/construction trades.

Tom Peterson, Hoffman Construction, volunteered to serve on the Data Collection Subcommittee.

Ms. Septelka reported she recently resigned from Washington State University and has accepted a position with King County, managing a GC/CM project. King County supports her participation and involvement with the CPARB.

Ms. Deakins advised Ms. Septelka that subcommittee meetings must be treated as regular meetings and must be publicized. Minutes should be taken at each meeting. Staff will ensure meetings are advertised.

Discussion ensued about minutes of subcommittee meetings and concerns that members will be overly burdened in preparing minutes. Mr. Eng recommended recording the meetings. Chair Lynch suggested that recording and transcribing are not necessary and that meeting notes will suffice.

Chair Lynch referred to committee membership and the previous discussion to limit the Expansion Subcommittee membership to 15 members. The subcommittee chair will recommend membership with approval by the Board. He offered suggestions to consider a membership limit within each subcommittee.

Mr. Eng reported he received an e-mail from Dick Lutz requesting to be a member of the Reauthorization Subcommittee along with Larry Stevens and Ashley Probart.

Kathy Haigh moved, seconded by Dave Johnson, to add Dick Lutz, Larry Stevens, and Ashley Probart as members of the Reauthorization Subcommittee. Motion carried.

Wendy Keller moved, seconded by Kathy Haigh, to add Larry Byers, Dick Lutz, Larry Stevens, and Ashley Probart as members of the Expansion Subcommittee. Motion carried.

Ms. Septelka reported there are no additional members for the Data Collection Subcommittee at this time. Chair Lynch reported he will pursue recruiting members from GA and OFM.

Members discussed the protocol for substitute subcommittee members.

Kathy Haigh moved, seconded by Dave Johnson, to limit subcommittee membership to 15 voting members and allow substitutions for designated members who may vote on the absence member's behalf. Motion carried.

Decide on Subcommittees Work

Chair Lynch advised members to combine topics and define the scope of each subcommittee. Consider topic rankings as well as all members' issues and show linkage of the subcommittee's scope to CPARB's legislative assignment. Finally, target completion date and milestone dates to ensure deliverables are completed and on time. Staff will summarize the information as a checklist and transmit the information to the subcommittees as a reminder.

Set Regular Meeting Dates

Chair Lynch recommended scheduling CPARB's regular meeting on the second Thursday of each month from 9:00 a.m. to noon. The Board agreed to schedule the monthly meetings and cancel if not needed.

Next Meeting Agenda

The next meeting is December 8, 2005. The agenda will include:

- Subcommittee Reports
- School District Presentation
- Competitive Negotiation Contracting (tentative)

Adjournment

Chair Lynch adjourned the meeting at 1:40 p.m.

Prepared by: Valerie Gow, Recording Secretary
Puget Sound Meeting Services